

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4-7, and 10-11 are now pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

1. Claims 1, 5, 7-8, and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by ITO (JP Pat. No. 09-159985). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the allowable subject matter of claim 3. Claim 1 now recites that the display comprises light dividing means that include a plurality of reflectors that correspond to the respective plurality of modulation means. The reflectors are arranged in an optical path of the light emitted by the light source to reflect the emitted light respectively toward the corresponding modulation means. Claim 1 also now recites that each of the reflectors are an integrated unit including a reflecting section for reflecting part of the emitted light toward the corresponding modulation means and a transmitting section for passing another part of the emitted light through other reflectors arranged apart from the light source. Because claim 1 has been amended to include the allowable subject matter of claim 3, Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 1 and each corresponding dependent claim are not anticipated. Further, Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 1 and each corresponding dependent claim are now in condition for allowance.

Claim 7 has been amended to include the allowable subject matter of claim 9. Claim 7 now calls for light directing means for directing at least part of the light to each

of the plurality of modulators. Claim 7 also now calls for the light directing means to include a plurality of light reflectors sequentially positioned along an optical path of the light, wherein at least an upstream one of the plurality of light reflectors is partially transmissive. Because claim 7 has been amended to include the allowable subject matter of claim 9, Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 7 and each corresponding dependent claim are not anticipated by ITO. Further, Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 7 and each corresponding dependent claim are now in condition for allowance.

2. Claims 1, 6, and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Deter (JP Pat. No. 2000-214529). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As stated above, claims 1 and 7 have been amended to include the allowable subject matter of claims 3 and 9, respectively. Because claims 1 and 7 have been amended to include the allowable subject matter of claims 3 and 9, respectively, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 1, 7, and each corresponding dependent claim are not anticipated by Deter. Furthermore, claims 1, 7, and each corresponding dependent claim are now in condition for allowance.

3. Claims 1 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Tabata (JP Pat. 2002-214707). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Again, as stated above, claims 1 and 7 have been amended to include the allowable subject matter of claims 3 and 9, respectively. Claims 1, 7, and each corresponding dependent claim, therefore, are in condition for allowance.

4. Claims 1-2, 4 and 7-8 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Takahara et al (U.S. Pat. No. 6,049,364). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As stated above, claims 1 and 7 have been amended to include the allowable subject matter of claims 3 and 9, respectively. Claims 1, 7, and each corresponding dependent claim, therefore, are now in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The Examiner states that claims 3 and 9 are objected to because they depend from a rejected base claim, but would be in condition for allowance should these claims be rewritten in independent form to include the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim. Accordingly, Applicant has amended claims 1 and 7, respectively, to include the allowable subject matter of claims 3 and 9. Accordingly, independent claims 1 and 7 and their corresponding dependent claims are now in condition for allowance.


CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt

and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 23, 2005

By: 
G. Gregory Schivley, Reg. No. 27,382
Bryant E. Wade, Reg. No. 40,344

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

GGG/BEW/JAH